2. 148-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1891-92

~~192~~.

(L. R.)

File No.

Serial Nos.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-5

Part B for August 1892

SUBJECT.

Claims to manage the Jodi Village of Pollikan, Kurnigal Taluk

To the Deputy Commr., Trichy District

No. 3684/P.7. 148-92 dated 8-8-1892

Forwarding copy of endorsement granted Madhava Rao Agent and Jodidar of Pollikan, Zilla Kurnigal Taluk, informing that Govt. cannot compel the Jodidar to appoint him as their agent and Pandaraga

WD 2nd-hand Sale 12-6-20

Returned with

Appeal No.

Appellant.
Madhva Rao
Agent of Gottikere.

Memo.

In 1879, the petitioner was appointed by the Amildar as agent of the Jodi village, Gottikere. In January 1889, he complained to the Amildar that Ramachar and some other Vittidars interfered with his work. The Amildar ordered that there should be no interference

as the ~~Amildar~~ Agent had been appointed by the Government with the Vettidars' consent. This order did not take effect. Thereupon the petitioner and also his opponents addressed the Dy. Commissioner, the former requesting that he might be allowed to do his duties as usual, and the latter that the petitioner's removal from the office of Agent might be sanctioned. The Deputy Commissioner, after an inquiry made by the Amildar, ordered that Government could not interfere in the matter and the Vettidars were at liberty to appoint their own Agent.

The appeal is against the above order.

The petitioner contends —

(1) that the office of Gajaman and Agent is his hereditary right, and his ancestors and latterly himself held the office long before the date of the Amildar's order formally appointing him as Agent, and

(2) that the Ag. Commissioner's order is unjust and against manool.

The Counter-petitioners charge the Agent, before the Amildar,

(1) of misappropriation of money due to the Vittidars, (2) of having made certain excess collection, and (3) of having omitted to bring on account certain items of Kandayam collected.

The Amildar, represented that

the charges were ill-founded and due to the ill-feeling existing between the Agent and some of the Vettidars.

The point for decision is — whether Government can interfere in the matter, or should allow the Vettidars to appoint their Agent under the circumstances.

The Counter-petitioners have produced the documents noted in the margin. These by themselves do not go to show the misconduct of the Agent.

1. The Ayngyishi Accounts of the year Akshaya (800-1)
2. The Kazul Baki Book for the year Vijaya (8[illegible]-[illegible])
3. A receipt given by the Agent to Siddia
4. Do do to Nonna
5. Do do to Moodiyiri.

The appellant has not ~~presented~~ produced any evidence to show that the office claimed is hereditary.

The Amildar's order No. 217 dated 10th June 1870, is to the

effect that the petitioner is appointed agent for the time being with the Villagers' consent.

R
4/7/92

The following answer may be given.—

The Govt cannot compel the Villagers to appoint Petitioner as their agent or Manager. If Petitioner has a right to manage the village he must establish the same in a Court of Law.—

U.P.
24/8/92

Note

The order in Rev Manual page 45 must be considered to be obsolete) & even if it be in force, it is optional with Govt to approve or not to approve an agent.

U.P.
24/8/92

A precis of papers connected with the petition of Randagudi Madhava Row, Jodidar and Agent of the Jodi village Gottikere in the Kunigal Taluk.

The Petitioner claims the office of Gojaman and Agent of this Jodi village to be his hereditary hak. He has been holding this office since the year 1879 when he was appointed to it by the Amildar, with the consent of the Vrittidars of the village. He did duties uninterruptedly till

1887 when some of the Vrittidars seem to have complained to the Amildar against the petitioner of certain irregularities. It is not known how the complaint was disposed of.

On the 28th January 1889, the Petitioner addressed the Amildar stating that although he had a hereditary right to the office of Agent, and also been formally appointed to it by the Government, Ramchar and some other Vrittidars who were his enemies interfered with his work, instigated the Ryots not to pay

In December 89, the Petitioner's opponents, Ramaghar and others addressed the Amildar and the Dy Commissioner stating — that they had appointed the Petitioner as agent to do the collection and other work of the village; that he failed to do his duties and was guilty of certain irregularities; and that therefore they dismissed him and got the necessary work done by the Patel and Shanbhog; and praying that the action taken by them might be confirmed, as they were ready to prove the agent's misconduct.

As required by the Dy. Commissioner, the Amildar reported that the village consisted of 24 vrittis, of which the Petitioner was the owner of 8 and the manager of 7½ vrittis; that he had issued orders that until the Agent's misconduct was established against him, he should be allowed to do work as usual; and that owing to the ill-feeling existing between the Agent on one hand and some of the Vrittidars, the Patil and Shanbhog on the other, the Agent was not allowed to do work as usual.

On enquiry before the Amildar under the orders of the Dy. Commissioner the Vrittidars made the following charges against the Agent—

I The sums of Rs 3, Rs 2 and Rs 1-4 collected from Siddia, Honna and Moodlagiri respectively for the year Sarvadhari (1888-89) had not been brought on account; for the account, when called for by the Vrittidars, was not produced.

II That the Agent had given out, on his own authority, the maddik land called "Dansoina

mandejamin" to Miya Sahi and two others, and had been misappropriating Rs 9-9-0 annually collected from them.

III That ~~Rs 1-12-0 and Re 1~~ he unauthorizedly ~~omitted~~ omitted to collect Rs 1-12-0 and Re 1 due by Jawara and Venkatramana respectively:

IV. That he collected 4 as. in excess from Bommalinge gonda, taking Rs 9-12-0 instead of Rs 9-8-0.

After making the necessary enquiries, the Amildar, submitted his report (paper No. 15.), on the 5th August 79, to the effect — that the Vittidar brought several charges

Two Rupees stamp affixed.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 24744
DATE 31-12-91

(1)

(1) stamp Correct
(2) appeal in time
(3) Copy of Order produced
(4).

(General Serial No. 32.) (2)

1892

No. 16

Name of Petitioner. Madhwa Rao Agent of Jodidar, Jodi Gottaka Village.

Village. Yeligur

Taluk. Kunigal

District. Tumkur

Date of Arzi. 30th March 92

Date of Receipt. 1st April 92.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. One -

~~ABSTRACT.~~ Subject-

Petitioner prays that an order may be issued confirming him as Agent of Jodi Gottaka Village, Kunigal Taluk.

The petitioner alleges that the office of Agent (Gramani) of the Jodi is his hereditary hakk. & that the Dy Commr's Order in declining to interfere in upholding petitioner's claim is unjust.

Call for Reps.
BO.
22/5/92

(2)

Contract
[illegible]
1/4/92

R. (3)

~~76~~ Encl issued 30/5

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 16/2474. dated 30th March 1892 received at the Dewan's Office from Ramchandra Rao, agent to Jodidar of Gollahalli Yelugur, Kunigal Taluk praying that he may be confirmed as agent of Jodi Gollahalli

~~is~~ are forwarded, together with its ~~one~~ two enclosure~~s~~ to the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur for submission of proofs and for report on the facts of the case and the points taken in the petition

2 The petition should be returned

From the same No. 17 of 1892

By Order,

Draft

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 30 June 1892

OFFICE OF THE
15 JUN. 92
PETTAH
VAN O. NY

From The Registrar
Jaffna District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Govt. of Ceylon

Dated 9th June 1892

Registered 11th 20

Received (4)

No: 47. Encls. Recd. in a separate book

Submit the records connected with the complaint of Sinadiamby Cooppan of the Jaffna Care of Gottikern in the Kungal Valai with report as directed in Govt. No. 7 dated 30th May 1892.

Petn Branch Mon 13/6/92

Velupillai Naraya
for a prem
by the 25th inst
16/6/92

Subm to the Sec.
This client has a prem for the past 20 days unfinished. He may be placed off this altogether or granted much longer time.
16/6

Visitation for prem.

A
16-6-92

The same No. 3584 P. 248

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Tumkur District

Camp Gordigere 12th June 1892

No. 47.
Inclo Recd

(4)

To.

The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Mysore

Sir

With reference to your official Memorandum No. 77 of the 30th ultimo forwarding for submission of Proceedings and for report a petition from Madhava Row, Agent of the Jodidars of Gottikere in the Kunigal Taluk, I have the honor to submit as follows.

2. In December 1889 some of the Jodidars of the said Gottikere village named in the margin applied for the removal of the petitioner from the agentship on the ground that he had misconducted himself. The Amildar held an enquiry into the matter and forwarded the record for orders. In reply he was informed that Government could not interfere in disputes between the Jodidars and their Agents and that

1 Ramappa
2. Soobanna
3 Nandagudi Venkappa
4 Narana bhatta
5 Shanbogue Venkatakrishnia
6 Shanbogue Soobbanna
7 Baranna gowda.

the former were at liberty to appoint any agent they liked.

3. In his appeal petition to government the agent says that as I interfered in the matter of the Potely of the village there was no reason to refuse interference in his case. Questions of appointments of Potels and Shanbogues for Inam villages are to be disposed of under Section 14 of the Revenue Code and section 4 of the Revenue Rules and that accounts for any order that may have been passed in regard to the Potely of this village.

4. The entire record of the case is enclosed as also the appeal petition &c received with your Memo under reply.—

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant.

Deputy Commissioner

their Kandayams to him and were trying to collect the Revenue themselves.

Thereupon the Amildar ordered the Shekdar of Hutridgey to inform the people of the village that they had no reason to interfere with the duties of the Agent, as he had been appointed by the Government with the consent of the Vrittidars.

On the 19th March 89, the Petitioner again represented to the Amildar that his order had not been complied with. The Shekdar being requested to report the matter

submitted that the Vritti dars. said — that it was not the Govt, but it was they themselves that appointed the Agent, and that as he committed irregularities in the collection of revenue, they themselves collected it through the Shanbhog.

Meanwhile, on the 11th November 89, the Petitioner addressed the Amildar and also the Dy Commissioner of Lumkur praying that he might be allowed to hold his hereditary office of agent of the village without molestation.

against the agent, and after much delay produced some accounts and papers, and that the case seemed to have originated from a mere quarrel between the agent and the Vrittidars, ~~[illegible]~~ no complaint having been brought by those from whom he was stated to have collected more than what was due.

On this report, the Dy Commissioner passed order No. 195 dated 8th August 90, that there was no reason for the Government to interfere in the matter and that the people of the village were at liberty to

appoint any agent they pleased.

The Petitioner appeals against the above order.

The Petitioner contends –

1. that the office of Yajaman and Agent is his hereditary hak
2. that his ancestors and latterly himself held the office long before the date of the Amildar's order appointing him formally as Agent, and
3. that the Dy Commissioner's order is unjust and against Inamool.

yl
4/7/92

Draft for approval

(4) (5)

R. 164-91-5

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
26th August 1892.

Endorsement granted to Madhwa Rao, agent and Jodidar of Goltakera, Yelipur, Kunigal Taluk,
in reply to his Petition, Registered No. 16/24/4 dated 30-3-92 & 26-12-91.

Petitioner is informed that the Government cannot compel the Jodidars to appoint him (Petitioner) as their agent and manager. If Petitioner has a right to manage the village, he must establish the same in a Court of Law.

2 The enc: are returned.

4/9/92

3684 8/9/92
Pet: F: 148-92 Draft
(Council order)

"By Order,"

To Chief Secretary.

Copy to the Deputy Commr. Tumkur Dist. returning ver: Proceedings received with his No. 47 of 11th June/92

Encl & copy to Dy. Commr. issued with enclosures 8/9/92

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000.